Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/395,409	Applicant(s) CANTOR ET AL.	
	Examiner Heather G. Calamita, Ph.D.	Art Unit 1637	

All Participants:

(1) *Heather G. Calamita, Ph.D.*.

(2) *Frank Miskiel*.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: *13 April 2004*

Time: *4:45 EST*

Type of Interview:
- ☒ Telephonic
- ☐ Video Conference
- ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:
58-60, 63, 111-113, 127, 133 and 135.

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: There was a typographical error in the office action mailed August 29, 200. Claim 127 was omitted from the 102 rejection heading and claims 58-60, 63, 111-113, 133 and 135 were omitted from the 103 (a) rejection heading in the office actio, however the claim limitations were addressed in the body of the rejection. I spoke with Mr. Mkskiel to confirm with him that he did in fact address these rejectons in his response filed on February 9, 2005. Mr. Miskiel confirmed his response addressed these claims and made a not of this in the file. .